



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 10/785,486 | 02/24/2004 | Russell A. Houser | 019 | 1784 |
| 32867 | 7590 | 10/15/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| WILLIAM DOUGLAS HARE | | | BACHMAN, LINDSEY MICHELE | |
| 3 ANDERSON LANE | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| PRINCETON, NJ 08540 | | | 3734 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 10/15/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/785,486 | HOUSER ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | LINDSEY BACHMAN | 3734 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 21-23,25-36,38-48 and 50-57 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 36,38 and 55 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 21-23,25,39-48,50-54,56 and 57 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed 7 July 2008.

Election/Restrictions

Newly amended claim 36 and 38 and 55 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: it is specifically claimed for use within the heart and it also contains multiple arms extending from a base. The device claimed in Claim 21 could be used to perform a materially different method, such as compressing an eyeball in order to treat eye refractive errors.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 36, 38 and 55 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 32, 33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 32 and 33 recite the limitation "the deployment section". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 21, 25-30, 35, 47-48, 50-52, 54, and 57 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shahinpoor et al. (US Patent 6,511,508).

Claim 21, 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 47, 51, 52, 54, 57: Shahinpoor discloses a device that contains a layer of biocompatible material (4) and a layer of shape memory alloy (SMA) (20) covered on both the top and bottom sides by the biocompatible material (see Figure 1f). When in the heated configuration, the ends of the SMA layer move towards each other (Figure 4a shows the cooled configuration, Figure 4b shows the heated configuration). Shahinpoor also discloses a method for deploying this device (column 6, line 61 to column 7, line 11).

Claim 25, 26: Shahinpoor teaches protrusions (22) extending from the SMA and attaching a power source to the protrusions (column 6, lines 39-47).

Claim 48: The eyeball contains blood vessels.

Claim 50: The device contains attachment means (24).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 22, 23, 31-33, 34 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shahinpoor'508.

Claim 22, 23: Shahinpoor does not specifically teach the use of nitinol, however it is old and well known in the art that nitinol is a common SMA used in surgical devices.

Claims 31-33, 39-44, 46, 56: Shahinpoor does not specifically teach a deployment device, however, Shahinpoor discloses a procedure to deploying the device (column 6, line 61 to column 7, line 11). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have a surgeon use deployment tools, including those with suction to maintain the eye's position.

Claim 34 and 45: It is old and well known to combine surgical tools with therapeutic drugs in order to aid in treating the body. Shahinpoor even acknowledges this when referring to the prior art in column 2, line 60 to column 3, line 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Shahinpoor device with therapeutic drugs in order to aid in treating the body.

Claim 47, 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peng et al. (US Patent 6,730,020) in further view of Shahinpoor'508.

Peng'020 teaches the device substantially as claimed (see Figure 3), except the SMA is not in a single sheet.

Shahinpoor'508 teaches that it is old and well known to use a single sheet of SMA. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Peng'020 with a single sheet as taught by Shahinpoor'508 in order apply a known technique to a known device ready for improvement to yield predictable results.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LINDSEY BACHMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-6208. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 7:30 am to 5 pm, and alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jackie Ho can be reached on 571-272-4696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 3734

/(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773